



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/571,502	03/10/2006	Hans Jurgen Neuhaus	079577.0107	8194
31625 7590 07/07/2009 BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. PATENT DEPARTMENT 98 SAN JACINTO BLVD., SUITE 1500 AUSTIN, TX 78701-4039				
EXAMINER				
AJIBADE AKONAI OLUMIDE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/07/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/571,502

Applicant(s)

NEUHAUS, HANS JURGEN

Examiner

OLUMIDE T. AJIBADE AKONAI

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-28 and 35-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 16-23 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-28 and 35-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 24, 2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 35-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 35-39 recited the limitation "an extension line having a length of at least fifty centimeters and up to about several meters". However, this limitation is not disclosed in the specification. The specification discloses an extension line 8, for lengthening of the lines that connect GSM modem 2 to SIM card 1 (see figure 1 of applicant's drawing, page 7 of applicant's specification, [0026]). The specification however does not disclose that extension line has a length of

at least fifty centimeters and up to about several meters. This limitation is not adequately supported by the specification and constitutes new matter. The examiner respectfully requests that the applicant provide page(s), line(s), and/or figure(s) of the instant application that supports limitation in the claims.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 36 is objected to because of the following informalities: "drive" should be deleted and replaced with "driver" on line 7. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Hutchison, IV et al 6,839,570 (hereinafter Hutchison).

Regarding **claim 24**, Hutchison discloses a method for bidirectional data transmission between a SIM card (122, see figs. 1 and 2A, col. 4, line 60) and a GSM modem (modem 120, see figs. 1 and 2A, col. 4, line 63) wherein the bidirectional data transmission takes place without the use of a control signal for the data direction on a data line that connects the SIM card and the GSM modem (data line 212, see fig. 2A, col. 6, lines 59-64).

Regarding **claim 26** as applied claim 25, Hutchison further discloses wherein the at least one edge driver can in each case be optimized to the clock rate of the data transmission by inserting a coupling capacitor (see fig. 2A and 3, col. 10, lines 1-29).

Regarding **claim 27** as applied claim 25, Hutchison further discloses wherein the interference voltage separation of the at least one edge driver can in each case be set, by means of a resistor (214, see figs. 2A and 2B, col. 6, lines 55-64, col. 7, lines 23-62).

Regarding **claim 28** as applied claim 25, Hutchison further discloses wherein the response threshold of the at least one driver can in each case be set or tuned by means of a resistor (214, see figs. 2A and 2B, col. 6, lines 55-64, col. 7, lines 23-62).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 16-23 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 24 April 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claim 24, the applicant's representative asserts that Hutchison fails to teach or suggest "a bidirectional data transmission that takes place without use of control signal", as recited in claim 24. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Hutchison's external SIM I/F 130b does not disclose use of a control signal. The SIM I/F 130b discloses the use of the common data 212 between the modem 120 and SIM such that when the modem transmit portion transmit along the common line at a high voltage, the SIM circuit connected to the common line 212 pulls-up to the voltage on the line and when a transmit portion transmits along the common line at a low voltage, a low voltage impedance path on the common line is provide to the SIM (see

col. 6 line 55 to col. 7, line 38). The examiner thus maintains that the bidirectional transmission occurs without the use of a control signal but through transmission along the common line via Bus I/F circuit 214.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Krishnan et al 7,137,003 discloses subscriber identity module verification during power management.

Krishnan et al 20020120852 discloses power management for subscribers identity module.

Arai et al 5,655,009 discloses a modem unit.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLUMIDE T. AJIBADE AKONAI whose telephone number is (571)272-6496. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8.30p-5p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on 571-272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OA

/Charles N. Appiah/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617